



**FILED**

07-16-07  
04:59 PM

## NOTICE OF PROTEST AGAINST A PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT

Consolidated Valley-Ivyglen 115 kV Subtransmission line Project and Fogarty Substation Project.

Date: July 16, 2007

A Formal Hearing to Protest (Article 1 and Rule 2.6 of California Public Utilities Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure) SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY'S Application for a Permit to construct electrical Facilities with Voltages between 50 kV and 200 kV: Consolidated Valley-Ivyglen 115 kV Sub transmission line Project Application No. A. 07-01-031 (Filed January 16, 2007) and Fogarty Substation Project Application No. A. 07-04-028 (Filed April 30, 2007).

The Grounds for the Protest, the effect of the application on the protestant, and the reasons the protestant Believes the application, or a part of it, is not justified are listed below.

1. By Consolidating the Projects the protestor believes the scope of the project and parameters have changed substantially and will adversely affect the protestor. I believe the application should be Denied and Southern California Edison Company (SCE) resubmits their application to address the changes and scope of project.

2. I believe SCE has continually ignored the public input requirement of their Application. The fact that SCE is trying to consider a Public Open House as meeting that requirement. The protestor will present testimonies as to how there were few questions answered by SCE representatives. They either did not have the information, gave a misleading answer or as discovered later, lied. That cannot be accepted as public input. Further more on previous correspondence with SCE, residents were asked for concise concerns about the project. They were listed by residents and SCE's response to the residents and CPUC was that the residents did not present evidence or prove their concerns. That was not asked for or Offered. That was not asked for at that time. Residents will also provide testimony on how SCE Representatives misled them by Stating the open house was just a preliminary step and did not necessary mean project would be routed thru their neighborhood. We were also told there would be a public meeting if project was approved and we could Protest then

SCE representatives gave few answers to questions, so there was little to no input from participants.

3. SCE stated a study was done concluding that the project would not affect property values without presenting any facts to justify that conclusion. At a hearing, documentation from area Realtors will be presented on how the projects would negatively affect protestor's property development and values.

4. SCE stated a study was done that the project did not pose an unsightly effect on the areas it is traveling thru. At the requested hearing, testimony will be presented on how the quality of life will be affected. We would also like to hear from the commissioners themselves on how they would not mind having these 65-foot poles and power lines in their front yards.

5. I believe the application should be denied for the fact SCE has continually circumvented the process and presented facts that are not true, as will be proven at Hearing.

6. The residents also like to see evidence that all area residents and owners were notified by SCE and the percentage that responded in any manner. Documentation will be provided as to how many property owners and area residents have no knowledge of said project. SCE has provided no evidence that property owners had knowledge of project. There is no definitive evidence that mailed notices were received.

7. Public Safety has been questioned by the protestor and SCE has not responded to or presented any study addressing those concerns. The fact that Conard and Rostrata Ave are unimproved to county standards with no curbs or street markings. That fact would virtually put the 3-foot diameter 65-foot polls in the roadway. This would be putting all residents and the students of Temescal High School, who use those roads as access to the School, as do the school buses, in eminent danger. The project polls would narrow an already narrow road, endangering everyone.

8. The fact that Stonehouse rd is not even wide enough to be county maintained makes it dangerous. Stonehouse Rd. goes up a hill and the tall polls would create a no-fly zone. The area would then be denied Police and fire air support endangering residents and raising insurance rates.

9. Southern California Edison did not notify Warm Spring Valley Association in which the Project is traveling thru. This will negatively affect the roads and way of life in District 124 and the residents would

Like to have, their input considered as they have many unanswered concerns and fears.

**Respectfully submitted,**

**X /S/** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Terrence Thomas Smith**

**X/S/** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Valarie McNeal Smith**

**X/S/** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Mary Appleman - Thompson**

**Dated: July 16, 2007**

**Certificate of Service**  
**(Rule 1.9, 1.10)**

**I hereby certify that pursuant to Rules 1.9 and 1.10 of the CPUC Rules of Practice and Procedure, I have served electronically and/or by mail a copy of the foregoing document:**

**Protest of Terrence Thomas Smith, Valarie McNeal Smith, and Mary Apple man - Thompson, President, Warm Springs Valley Association, to A.07-04-028 and A.07-01-031,**

**on the Commission Service List for these consolidated proceedings, copies of which are appended hereto.**

**I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.**

**Executed on July 16, 2007 at Lake Elsinore, CA**

**/S/\_\_\_\_\_**  
**Terrence T. Smith**  
**28281 Rostrata Ave.**  
**Lake Elsinore, California 92532**  
**E-mail: vt111597@aol.com**